UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,839	02/07/2007	Edwin Ijpeij	4662-145	7520
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 04/14/200 NDERHYE. PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	LU, C CAIXIA		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/566,839	IJPEIJ ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Caixia Lu	1796					
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communice - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ation. Ty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <i>4/2/</i> 09						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	This action is non-final.						
<i>7</i>		atters prosecution as to th	e merits is				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
·	masi za parte gaayre, 1000 e.	.5. 11, 100 0.0. 210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the appli							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.							
7)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	') Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	xaminer.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	•						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc	cuments have been received.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action fo	r a list of the certified copies no	of received.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		v Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Informal Patent Application							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:							

Application/Control Number: 10/566,839 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The application/patent being disclaimed has been improperly identified since the number used to identify the application/US patent being disclaimed is incorrect due to the inadvertent error in the previous Final Office Action mailed January 5, 2009. The correct number is Application No. 10/566,979, now US Patent No. 7,524,906. The previous Final Office Action mailed is now withdrawn and replaced by the following Final Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 as originally filed appears to directed to a one step process for the preparation of a metal-organic compound by contacting imine ligand according to formula I or the HA adduct thereof in the presence of 1 or 2 equivalents of a base respectively with a metalorganic reagent of formula 2. However, the current claim 1 are directed to a one step process for the preparation of a metal-organic compound by

Page 3

contacting imine ligand according to formula I or the HA adduct thereof in the presence of 1 or 2 equivalents of a base with a metalorganic reagent of formula 2. Omitting the word "respectively" allow claim 1 to including the following scopes:

- i) a one step process for the preparation of a metal-organic compound by contacting imine ligand according to formula I in the presence of 2 equivalents of a base with a metalorganic reagent of formula 2, and
- ii) a one step process for the preparation of a metal-organic compound by contacting the HA adduct of imine ligand according to formula I in the presence of 1 equivalents of a base with a metalorganic reagent of formula 2.

Processes i) and ii) does not appear to be supported by the application as originally filed.

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1

The term "imine ligand" in lines 2 and 3 of claim 1 should be replaced --imine ligand compound--.

Claim 9

The subject in the front of limitation, "carried out in the presence of 3 or 4 equivalents of an organolithium- or an organomagnesium compound", is missing.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,839 Page 4

Art Unit: 1796

The limitation of "3 or 4 equivalents of an organolithium- or an organomagnesium compound" lacks antecedence since the base can not be more than 2 equivalents according to claim 1.

Claim 15

The subject in the front of limitation, "in the presence of between 5 and 10 equivalents of the imine ligand according to formula 1", is missing.

The limitation of "imine ligand" should be replaced --imine ligand compound--.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,524,906 (Application No. 10/566,979). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are

not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed subject matter of both set of claims are substantially identical.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to previous rejections have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment filed December 5, 2008 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Caixia Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1106. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m..

Application/Control Number: 10/566,839 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Caixia Lu/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796